UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/740,467	12/22/2003	Lance Everett Good	117035	3625

65575 7590 10/28/2009

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. BOX 320850
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850

EXAMINER	
TERMANINI, SAMIR	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2179	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/28/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/740,467	GOOD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Samir Termanini	2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *09 July 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-5,7-23 and 25-34* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-5,7-23 and 25-34* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *22 December 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

BACKGROUND

1. This action is responsive to communications filed on 7/9/2009.

2. Claims 1-5, 7-23 and 25-34 are pending. Claims 1, 5, 11, 16-18, 20, 23, 32 and 33 are amended. Claim 34 is new.

RESPONSE TO AMENDMENT

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5, 7-23 and 25-34 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection discussed below. In response to the instant amendment, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) (made on 4/28/2009) have been withdrawn.

CLAIM REJECTIONS-35 U.S.C. § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out

the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. **Claims 1-5, 7-23 and 25-34** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Zoomable user interfaces as a medium for slide show presentations*, Lance Good & Benjamin B Bederson, Published March 2002, http://goodle.org/papers/counterpoint-infovis.pdf (hereinafter *Good/Benderson*) in view of *Litoiu et al.* (PgPub US 2004/0088678 A1).

As to independent **claim 1**, *Good/Benderson* describe(s): A method for supporting a slide presentation in a zoomable space, the method comprising ("The use of these tools for creating zoomable presentations…," p. 43): recursively providing a structure of presentation information ("…structure of the presentation…," p. 45), the presentation information including one or more of slides ("…slides…," p. 44), text labels ("…text labels…," p. 44), and graphical elements ("…graphical layouts…," p. 44). *Good/Benderson* illustrate providing a hierarchy in the presentation information, the hierarchy including different levels and analyzing the levels of the hierarchy and automatically laying out the presentation information in the zoomable space based on the levels of the hierarchy when the hierarchy is provided or in real time as the hierarchy is being provided; ("…Then, for each parent in the hierarchy, the authority of PowerPoint into CounterPoint (or vice-versa) for a can apply a modifiable layout template to spatially finer granularity of control ...," p. 44); synchronizing a layout of the presentation information in the zoomable space based on the structure of the presentation information:

> …the structure or logical organization of the presentation can be incorporated into the spatial layout of the data. Then, because CounterPoint slide transitions animate through the space, this structure is

> itself revealed to the audience during the normal course of the presentation.…

(p. 41) by providing a plurality of synchronizations through the presentation information and at different levels of a hierarchy in the presentation information. (see page 40, under the heading *Hierarchical support*):

> **Hierarchical support**
>
> One of the fundamental structures used in the presentation setting is the hierarchy. Hierarchies are a natural format for organizing data as they allow topics to be recursively subdivided into increasingly smaller units of information. In fact, current presentation tools often offer support for hierarchical bulleted outlines within slides, though they do not extend these hierarchical organizations to the slides themselves.
>
> ***
>
> ZUIs facilitate a more spatial portrayal of hierarchies. Instead of depicting hierarchy levels through indentation, as is frequently done, ZUIs can present hierarchies in a format that more closely approximates a 2D representation of a tree (for example, see2). Alternately, ZUIs allow for visually distinguishing hierarchy levels by placing them at varying levels of scale or magnification. This change in magnification can naturally vary with the level of the hierarchy.

(p. 40)(emphasis added).

Good/Benderson differs from claim 1 in that *Good/Benderson* do not specifically teach automatically updating the hierarchy when a user edits the layout in the zoomable space.

However, *Litoiu et al. teach* both views ("In the context of this invention there are two main views, the Zoomable Node View and the Hierarchy View.," para. [0035]) and further disclose:

> [0019] A second pane in the preferred embodiment shows a tree diagram, which will be called herein a hierarchical view, which illustrates a hierarchy of items in a process being analysed, and their relationship to each other. In particular, their parent-child relationships are visible in the

> hierarchical view. In the preferred embodiment, the parent in the hierarchical view is the overall process, and the children at various levels illustrate the sub-processes that are incorporated into the overall process.

That is, in addition to the regular updating, "Ordinary updates to Flow Model 402" (para. [0035]).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the relevant field at the time the invention was made to automatically the zoomable space when a user updates the hierarchy because such updates are recognized by *Litoiu et al.* to be readily adapted by persons skilled in the art as a form of a zoomable interface that displays selected nodes at magnifications that are continuously variable at the user's option ("Ordinary updates to Flow Model 402 can be readily adapted by persons skilled in the art.," para. [0035]) .

As to dependent **claim 2**, which depends from claim 1, *Good/Benderson* further disclose(s): The method according to claim 1, further comprising: creating a path based on a hierarchy, a path being a sequence of the presentation information for the slide presentation ("…create paths through the presentation space. When CounterPoint loads a presentation for the first time, a single default path is automatically generated that visits each of the PowerPoint slides. In general, these paths are composed of two types of components. The first, more obvious type is the actual PowerPoint slide, which is inserted on a path to animate the slide to full screen size. These slides are inserted into a path using a simple scrolling list of thumbnails. Each slide can also be inserted multiple times in a single path.…," p. 45); receiving a modification in at least one of the hierarchy and the layout; and updating a path based on the modification ("…views of sub-trees in the layout hierarchy (such as that seen in Figure 6) and views explicitly added to a path during authoring are also targets for navigations. As a result, CounterPoint offers

shortcuts for navigating to these locations. When the presenter moves the mouse within the bounds of either a sub tree or view, the bounds of the target view highlight. Right clicking within these highlighted bounds navigates to that location.…," p. 46).

As to dependent **claim 3**, which depends from claim 1, *Good/Benderson* further disclose(s): The method according to claim 1, wherein the structure of the presentation information is a hierarchy of the presentation information (e.g., see hierarchy on Figure on page 1).

As to dependent **claim 4**, which depends from claim 1, *Good/Benderson* further disclose(s): The method according to claim 1, further comprising displaying the presentation information based on a path ("…the layout hierarchy (such as that seen in Figure 6) …," p. 46).

As to dependent **claim 5**, which depends from claim 1, *Good/Benderson* further disclose(s): The method according to claim 1, further comprising synchronizing a hierarchy and the layout based on the modification ("…In cases where a presenter alters the presentation path using one of these dynamic navigations, the system attempts to pick an appropriate point in a path from which to resume. In cases where the target appears in multiple places on a path, CounterPoint picks a path entry closest to the point at which the presenter deviated from a path.…," p. 46).

As to dependent **claim 7**, which depends from claim 1, *Good/Benderson* further disclose(s): The method according to claim 1, further comprising displaying a path("…a view of a particular region of the zoomable space.…," p. 45).

As to dependent **claim 8**, which depends from claim 7, *Good/Benderson* further disclose(s): The method according to claim 7, wherein a path is displayed using thumbnail

images of the information ("…represented by a thumbnail image of the view…added to a path… These thumbnails are actually implemented as live views onto the presentation space so that modifications to the zoomable space are reflected in the thumbnail.…," p. 45).

As to dependent **claim 9**, which depends from claim 1, *Good/Benderson* further disclose(s): The method according to claim 1, further comprising displaying the updated path("…the view, is added to a path.…," p. 45).

As to dependent **claim 10**, which depends from claim 9, *Good/Benderson* further disclose(s): The method according to claim 9, wherein a path is displayed using thumbnail images of the information("…represented by a thumbnail image of the view, is added to a path. These thumbnails are actually implemented as live views onto the presentation space so that modifications to the zoomable space are reflected in the thumbnail.…," p. 45).

As to dependent **claim 11**, which depends from claim 2, *Good/Benderson* further disclose(s): The method according to claim 1, further comprising: taking a graphical image of a particular area of the zoomable space; and inserting the graphical image as presentation information in a path ("…image of the view, is added to a path.…," p. 45).

As to dependent **claim 12**, which depends from claim 1, *Good/Benderson* further disclose(s): The method according to claim 1, further comprising allowing a user to navigate the presentation information in a direction in the zoomable space, the direction including navigating to at least one of a higher level of a hierarchy ("…First, the presenter can press the up arrow key to navigate up the previously defined hierarchy. This zooms out enough to get an overview of a semantically meaningful group of slides. If the layout hierarchy has not been defined, pressing the up arrow key zooms out to give an overview of the entire space.…," p. 46), a lower level of a

hierarchy ("…page down key,…," p. 46), and the presentation information in the same level of a hierarchy ("…navigate to an overview…," p. 46).

As to dependent **claim 13**, which depends from claim 12, *Good/Benderson* further disclose(s): The method according to claim 12, further comprising at least one of: displaying indicators on a current slide such that text labels and/or the slides near the current slide are indicated; and displaying indications to indicate the level of hierarchy of the current slide ("…explicit indicator of progress by visually altering visited slides.…," p. 42).

As to dependent **claim 14**, which depends from claim 12, *Good/Benderson* further disclose(s): The method according to claim 12, wherein the navigation includes going to a higher level in a hierarchy ("…First, the presenter can press the up arrow key to navigate up the previously defined hierarchy. This zooms out enough to get an overview of a semantically meaningful group of slides. If the layout hierarchy has not been defined, pressing the up arrow key zooms out to give an overview of the entire space.…," p. 46), a lower level in a hierarchy ("…page down key,…," p. 46), another information in the same level of a hierarchy ("…navigate to an overview…," p. 46), and a root of a hierarchy (i.e. root nodes, see Fig. 7).

As to dependent **claim 15**, which depends from claim 12, *Good/Benderson* further disclose(s): The method according to claim 12, wherein the navigation includes zooming into ("…zooming in…," p. 35) and out ("…zooming out…," p. 35) from a particular area in the zoomable space.

As to independent **claim 16**, *Good/Benderson* describe(s): A method for supporting a slide presentation in a zoomable space, the method comprising: recursively providing a structure of presentation information, the presentation information including one or more of slides, text

labels, and graphical elements. *Good/Benderson* illustrate providing a hierarchy in the presentation information, the hierarchy including different levels ("Point has facilities for hierarchically organizing…distinguishing levels of detail…"pg. 36) and analyzing the levels of the hierarchy and automatically laying out the presentation information in the zoomable space in a format including at least one of an outline format ("…linear representations can be observed in the previously mentioned outline…," p. 40), and a nested rectangular grouping ("…layout templates corresponding to geometric shapes, such as…rectangles." p. 45)(emphasis added) based on the levels of the hierarchy when the hierarchy is provided or in real time as the hierarchy is being provided; ("…using one of these dynamic navigations, the system from which to resume. In cases where the target appears in multiple places on the path, CounterPoint picks the path…," p. 46); providing a layout of the presentation information in the zoomable space ("…authors provide layout…," p. 45); providing a path based on the structure of the presentation information ("…create paths through the presentation space.…," p. 45); and providing a plurality of synchronizations through the presentation information and at different levels of a hierarchy in the presentation information. (see page 40, under the heading *Hierarchical support*):

> **Hierarchical support**
>
> One of the fundamental structures used in the presentation setting is the hierarchy. Hierarchies are a natural format for organizing data as they allow topics to be recursively subdivided into increasingly smaller units of information. In fact, current presentation tools often offer support for hierarchical bulleted outlines within slides, though they do not extend these hierarchical organizations to the slides themselves.
>
> ***
>
> ZUIs facilitate a more spatial portrayal of hierarchies. Instead of depicting hierarchy levels through indentation, as is frequently done, ZUIs can present hierarchies in a format that more closely approximates a 2D representation of a tree (for example, see2). Alternately, ZUIs allow for visually distinguishing hierarchy levels by placing them at varying levels of scale or magnification. This change in magnification can naturally vary with the level of the hierarchy.

(p. 40)(emphasis added) and automatically updating a path based on a modification upon receiving the modification in at least one of the structure of the presentation information and the layout ("…automatically arranged…," p. 45).

Good/Benderson differs from claim 16 in that *Good/Benderson* do not specifically teach automatically updating the hierarchy when a user edits the layout in the zoomable space.

However, *Litoiu et al. teach* both views ("In the context of this invention there are two main views, the Zoomable Node View and the Hierarchy View.," para. [0035]) and further disclose:

> [0019] A second pane in the preferred embodiment shows a tree diagram, which will be called herein a hierarchical view, which illustrates a hierarchy of items in a process being analysed, and their relationship to each other. In particular, their parent-child relationships are visible in the hierarchical view. In the preferred embodiment, the parent in the hierarchical view is the overall process, and the children at various levels illustrate the sub-processes that are incorporated into the overall process.

That is, in addition to the regular updating, "Ordinary updates to Flow Model 402" (para. [0035]).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the relevant field at the time the invention was made to automatically the zoomable space when a user updates the hierarchy because such updates are recognized by *Litoiu et al.* to be readily adapted by persons skilled in the art as a form of a zoomable interface that displays selected nodes at magnifications that are continuously variable at the user's option ("Ordinary updates to Flow Model 402 can be readily adapted by persons skilled in the art.," para. [0035]) .

As to independent **claim 17**, *Good/Benderson* describe(s): A method for supporting a slide presentation in a zoomable space, the method comprising: recursively providing a hierarchy of presentation information, the presentation information including one or more of slides ("…slides…," p. 44), text labels ("…text labels…," p. 44), and graphical elements ("…graphical layouts…," p. 44); providing a layout of the presentation information in the zoomable space based on a hierarchy ("…hierarchically organizing presentation content to help automate spatial arrangement and assist in visually distinguishing levels of detail….," p. 36); providing a plurality of synchronizations through the presentation information and at different levels of a hierarchy in the presentation information. (see page 40, under the heading *Hierarchical support*):

> **Hierarchical support**
>
> One of the fundamental structures used in the presentation setting is the hierarchy. Hierarchies are a natural format for organizing data as they allow topics to be recursively subdivided into increasingly smaller units of information. In fact, current presentation tools often offer support for hierarchical bulleted outlines within slides, though they do not extend these hierarchical organizations to the slides themselves.
>
> ***
>
> ZUIs facilitate a more spatial portrayal of hierarchies. Instead of depicting hierarchy levels through indentation, as is frequently done, ZUIs can present hierarchies in a format that more closely approximates a 2D representation of a tree (for example, see2). Alternately, ZUIs allow for visually distinguishing hierarchy levels by placing them at varying levels of scale or magnification. This change in magnification can naturally vary with the level of the hierarchy.

(p. 40)(emphasis added) allowing a user to navigate the presentation information in a direction in the zoomable space ("…navigational controls allow a presenter to navigate between arbitrary points in the presentation…," p. 39).

Good/Benderson differs from claim 1 in that *Good/Benderson* do not specifically teach automatically updating the hierarchy when a user edits the layout in the zoomable space.

However, *Litoiu et al. teach* both views ("In the context of this invention there are two main views, the Zoomable Node View and the Hierarchy View.," para. [0035]) and further disclose:

> [0019] A second pane in the preferred embodiment shows a tree diagram, which will be called herein a hierarchical view, which illustrates a hierarchy of items in a process being analysed, and their relationship to each other. In particular, their parent-child relationships are visible in the hierarchical view. In the preferred embodiment, the parent in the hierarchical view is the overall process, and the children at various levels illustrate the sub-processes that are incorporated into the overall process.

That is, in addition to the regular updating, "Ordinary updates to Flow Model 402" (para. [0035]).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the relevant field at the time the invention was made to automatically the zoomable space when a user updates the hierarchy because such updates are recognized by *Litoiu et al.* to be readily adapted by persons skilled in the art as a form of a zoomable interface that displays selected nodes at magnifications that are continuously variable at the user's option ("Ordinary updates to Flow Model 402 can be readily adapted by persons skilled in the art.," para. [0035]) .

As to **claims 18-23 and 25–31**, these claims differ from claims 1–5 and 7-15, respectively, only in that they are directed to a system for carrying out the process defined by the processes of claims 1–5 and 7-15, respectively. Accordingly, claims 18-23 and 25–31 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the treatment of claims 1–5 and 7-15, respectively.

As to **claims 32–33**, these claims differ from claims 16–17, respectively, only in that they are directed to a system for carrying out the process defined by the processes of claims 16–17, respectively. Accordingly, claims 32–33 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the treatment of claims 16–17, respectively.

As to **claim 34** The method according to claim 1, wherein the layout of the presentation information in the zoomable space is an outline format in a nested rectangular grouping ("…Hierarchies are a natural format for organizing data as they allow topics to be recursively subdivided into increasingly smaller units of information. In fact, current presentation tools often offer support for hierarchical bulleted outlines within slides, though they do not extend these

hierarchical organizations to the slides themselves. p. 40); each level of the hierarchy in a bounded box with a title ("its title…;" Page 35).

RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5, 7-23 and 25-34 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection discussed above.

CONCLUSION

8. Although not relied upon, the following prior art is made of record because it considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

O'Neal; David Sheldon et al.	US 7131068 B2	System and method for electronic presentations having simultaneous display windows in a control screen
O'Neal; David et al.	US 7058891 B2	Interface for a system of method of electronic presentations having multiple display screens with remote input
Meyn; Catherine K. et al.	US 5859623 A	Intelligent display system presentation projection arrangement and method of using same
Treibitz; Alan et al.	US 6091408 A	Method for presenting information units on multiple presentation units

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Samir Termanini whose telephone number is (571) 270-1047. The Examiner can normally be reached from 9 A.M. to 4 P.M., Monday through Friday (excluding alternating Fridays).

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on (571) 272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, *see* http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Samir Termanini/
Examiner, Art Unit 2179

/Weilun Lo/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2179